

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the detailed Office Action of 11/18/2004.

The Applicants have updated Page 1 of the specification with the paragraph entitled “Cross-Reference to Related Application”. The Applicants submit that this amendment introduces no new matter.

Claim Objections

In Item 1 of the Report, the Examiner objects to Claims 7 and 9 for failing to further limit the subject matter of claims 5 and 1, respectively. In response, the Applicant has deleted the offending claims.

Double Patenting

In Item 3, the Examiner provisionally objects to claims 1, 9, 23 and 24 in the present application on the basis of a non-statutory double patenting considering co-pending Application No. 10/729,099 in view of Suzuki (US Patent Application Publication N 2003/0043273). The Examiner further objects to claims 2-5, 7 and 25 on the basis of a non-statutory double patenting considering the above documents in view of Purcel (USPN 6,227,643). Claim 14 is also objected considering Application No. 10/729,099 in view of Suzuki and Sarbadhikari (USPN 5,477,264). Similarly, claims 16-18 are objected as being unpatentable over co-pending Application No. 10/729,099 in view of Suzuki, Sarbadhikari and Lemelson (USPN 3,393, 563). Finally, claim 27 is objected as being unpatentable over co-pending Application No. 10/729,099 in view of Suzuki and Lemelson.

The Applicant contests the assertions of the Examiner that the above claims are unpatentable over respective claims in the cited documents. However, in the interest of expeditious prosecution of the application, the Applicant files a Terminal Disclaimer with respect to co-pending Application No. 10/729,099 and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c).

Claim Rejections

35 USC §112

Claim 15 is rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In response, the Applicant has emended the claim to remove the offending reference to a “Vark script”.

35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects claims 1-5, 7, 9, 23 and 25 as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Purcell. In response, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the feature of the printer including a “pagewidth” printhead. Because of its stationary configuration, this type of printhead has a simpler supporting structure and lower power consumption. Accordingly, this is a feature that is directly related to the overall inventive concept of a compact handheld camera with improved processing functionality and is, therefore, essential for the invention. This feature is disclosed in the table on page 12 of the specification and, thus, the amendment does not add any new matter to the specification.

The applicant draws to the Examiner's attention the fact that such a feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested in the cited prior art documents. On the contrary, there is a specific disclosure of scanning printheads (inkjet head 5 in Suzuki and print carriage 22 in Purcell), which in fact teach away from this feature. Thus, a person skilled in the art, apprised with the cited prior art documents, would not be able to derive the present invention as a matter of straightforward routine. As a result, it is submitted that the invention defined in the amended claim 1 is not only novel, but also possesses the requisite inventive step to qualify for patentability. Furthermore, the remaining claims are also novel and inventive, by virtue of their appendage to claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and a reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:

KIA SILVERBROOK

PAUL LAPSTUN

SIMON ROBERT WALSMLEY

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762